

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/686,417	10/11/2000	Johannes Stollenwerk	HERO7 P-441	6074
. 7	590 04/03/2003			
James a Mitchell			EXAMINER	
695 Kenmoor SE Post Office Box 2567			FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D	
Grand Rapids, MI 49501			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1774	
			DATE MAILED: 04/03/2003	

j4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/686,417	
Advisory Action		STOLLENWERK ET AL.
,	Examiner	Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	Ferguson	1774
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of A Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	APPLICATION IN CONDITI to avoid abandonment of the er: (1) a timely filed amendm ppeal (with appeal fee); or (4.	ON FOR ALLOWANCE. is application. A proper reply to a nent which places the application in 3) a timely filed Request for Continued
	REPLY [check either a) or	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing d b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of 637 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shor (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	s Advisory Action, or (2) the date set ter than SIX MONTHS from the mail WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH the date on which the petition under 3 extension and the corresponding am tened statutory period for reply origin	ing date of the final rejection. IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under ally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appell 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37		•
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require f	urther consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	ote below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicat issues for appeal; and/or	tion in better form for appea	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without ca	nceling a corresponding nur	nber of finally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) we canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request application in condition for allowance because		een considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	d because it is not directed S	SOLELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendr explanation of how the new or amended claim		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11 and 21-25</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is a)□ approved or b)□	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)
10. Other:	, ,	
		

14





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not shown that the reference cannot show the limitations as claimed. Applicant has not provided a persuasive argument which shows that the resistivity and transparency as claimed cannot be exhibited by the reference layered article. The reference article uses the same oxides and Ag layer in between and also show the layers having the same thickness values. Further, applicant points out how one can change variables to arrive at a certain resistivity. For these reasons, the rejection is maintained.

CYNTELA IL CELLI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

CYNTHIA H. KELLY
SUPERVISCOY PATENT SYAMMER
THO COLOGY CENTER 1700

Cinthtles